A TRUE COPY OF A LETTER

Lately Written by

Mr. *DOWLEY*

TO

Dr. *WELLS*,

And now publiſhed by Dr. WELLS,

Together with the

Doctor's ANSWER.

The Third Edition.

Imprimatur,

GUIL. DELAUNE

Vice-Can. OXON.

Apr. 10. 1706.

OXFORD,

Printed at the THEATER for *Jo. Stephens*, and are to be ſold by *James Knapton* at the Crown in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, *London*. 1706.

To Mr. PETER DOWLEY.

SIR,

HAD *the Letter* you lately writ and ſent to Me, related only to *My Self*, how Ill ſoever you have dealt with me therein, yet it ſhould for my part have never ſeen any other Light, than that of the *Fire*. But ſince your Letter is of *Publick* Concern, and relates not only to *My ſelf*, but to the *Controverſy* between Us; and ſince you and your Followers have with great Induſtry and Aſſurance given out, that it contain'd *a Full Anſwer* to *my Two Printed Letters*; I leave it to the World to judge, whether I am not under an Indiſpenſable Obligation of *Publiſhing* your Letter, that ſo I may *prove the Falſeneſs* of the Rumour ſpread abroad by you and your Party, and *Vindicate the Goodneſs* of the Cauſe I am Engaged in.

I can aſſure you, Sir, that I have been moſt ſtrictly Carefull, that no Injuſtice ſhould be done you by *Tranſcribing* your Letter, inſomuch that I have not ſuffer'd a *ſingle Letter or Comma* to be *Alter'd*. And I have alſo deſired, that the like Special Care might be taken by the *Printer*.

Before I come to the Conſideration of your Letter, I cannot but here Obſerve to you, how pregnant and lively an Inſtance is afforded *by you* and *your Followers*, of the ſtrange and deplorable *Obſtinacy* of *Willfull Prejudice*.

I cannot but in Charity think that *ſome of your Followers* will be ſo Juſt to Me, as to Bear me Witneſs, that upon Applying my Self to them in order to convince them of the *Sinfullneſs of their Separation*, they with a ſeeming Modeſty *Excuſed themſelves from Arguing thoroughly the Matter with me*, adding that *I would Do well to propoſe what I had to ſay to Mr. Dowley*, and that *they ſhould very much Like to*

have the Points in Controversy Fairly Debated Between Us Two for their Satisfaction. Hereupon I drew up my *Two Letters since* Published: for though I knew there were Already extant many Excellent Discourses or Books on such Subjects, yet I knew of No one that was *Suitable* either to *my own* Circumstances for to *Purchase and Distribute*, or to the Circumstances of *my Dissenting Parishioners* to *Peruse and Read.*

Now as *I had thus Not refused to take* (*no inconsiderable*) *Pains* at the Motion, and for the Satisfaction of your Followers aforesaid; So I did indeed Expect, and I think not without good Reason, that *you likewise should have been Moved and Prevailed with* by the same your Followers, *Not to refuse to take the like Pains* for their Satisfaction, namely by Putting into their Hands a *Direct and Particular Answer of your Own to All the several Points made out in my Letters* Against your and their Principles and Practices.

I leave the World to judge, whether This be Any other, than what your Followers above specified stand *in Honour Engaged* to Press and Prevail on you to Do; or whether else They have not Good Reason to suspect that *their Cause is Very Bad*, since you their Leader are Afraid to Appear Publickly in It's Behalf; and therefore whether They have not Good Reason to *Quit* and *Renounce* both it and You. Is it not then most Strange, and no other way to be Accounted for but by the Badness of your Cause, and the unreasonable Obstinacy and Blindness of *Prejudice*, that you, Sir, for your part should *Content* your Self to Do no more than *Send me a Written Letter* together with *De Laune's Plea for the Non-conformists*; and your Followers on their part should presently *be Contented* (without so much as the *Sight* or *Reading* of your Letter, and only) with a *bare implicit* (and so *Popish*) *Belief* of your Letter's containing a Satisfactory Answer to my Printed Letters?

That nothing may be wanting in me to Convince you and your Followers of such (your and their) unwarrantable *Prejudice* and *Partiality*, I shall consider Each Case distinctly; and out of Respect to you, Sir, I shall give your Case the First Place.

Your

Your Letter then may (as will appear hereafter) be distinguished into Three General parts, viz. *Bare Confident Assertions* intermixt with *Uncivil Language*; *Sham* or downright *False Reasons for your Not Appearing* in Print; and *Hints* (as you call them) of What Feats you *Could* Atchieve, were you but pleased *to be in the Mind*.

Whether I have not Abundantly Proved below, that *your Reasons* are no other than *meer Pretences* or *Downright Falsities*; and that the Hints you have given, expose (*not Mine*, but) *your own Nakedness*; let the impartial and judicious Reader determine. As for the other general Part of your Letter, I am very well content to be *altogether Condemn'd by you*, viz. Both as to *Bare Confidence of Assertion*, and also as to *Incivility of Language* or *Treatment*. Thus much for your Own Letter here in general.

As for *De Laune's Plea* &c. sent with your Letter, I *make you this very fair Offer*, that if you shall think fit to put forth any Treatise by way of *Proof* (of what you pretend, viz.) that the said *Plea is a full Answer to my Letters*, then I will hereby publickly engage my self (by God's Blessing) *to shew that you are very much mistaken*, and that *De Laune's Plea* (though somewhat *Bulky in Volume*, yet is very *Scanty as to sound Argument*, and) *doth not disprove Any One Point Asserted in my Letters*. And the same Offer that I here make you in reference to *De Laune's* Plea, I make you likewise in reference to the other Books (referred to in your Letter, viz.) of Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Clarkson*, Mr. *Alsop*, &c. And this is all you or your Followers can in Reason possibly *expect of me*, till *you make the way* for my *actually performing* what I *here engage*: for I am now only to *attend your Motions*.

Lastly, supposing Any of the Books aforemention'd *did contain a full Answer* to my Letters, yet are you, Sir, assured that *your Followers have* (or have you given your self the trouble to take care that they *should have*) *it for to read and give them Satisfaction*? Moreover, are you not perswaded, that what is said *more largely* in any of the aforesaid Books, might be brought into *narrower Compass*, and also might some other ways be render'd *more suitable* to the Circumstances

of your Followers? And therefore how can you acquit your self from taking (on such an Occasion) *a little more than ordinary Pains* for the *Greater Benefit* of your Party? Do you hereby approve your self to be *a Labourer in the Vineyard*? And now I have mention'd this Comparison of the Church to *a Vineyard*, it brings to my mind what seems to be the most natural, and so best Account of your being *so sparing of your Labour*. For you well know, that though there is need of a *great deal of Pains* to dress and keep *Vines* in due order, so as to bring forth *Good Fruit*; and not in time to *Degenerate* so far as to Bring forth *Wild Grapes*: yet on the other hand *Briers* and *Thorns* require *no such Care* to make them *thrive*, or to keep them from *Turning* or *Altering* so as to bear Good Fruit.

From what has been said, may appear the Strength of *your own Prejudice*, and Greatness of *your own Partiality*, in *Refusing* to give my Letters their *due Consideration*, and in *Contenting* your self *with what you have done*, and is already mention'd. I now proceed to the Case of *your Followers*, and to lay open the Obstinate *Prejudice* and *Partiality*, whereby *they* are carried away from *Rightly Considering what I have offered to* them in my Printed Letters, and are *Forced* at least to *make shew* of their being *fully Contented and Satisfied* even with *your doing nothing for their Satisfaction*.

I desire then of *your Followers* only to give me a Direct and Sincere Answer (as before God) to this Question, "Whether, *supposing upon the Motion of any of them you had* "Publickly *proposed to me your Objections against our Commu-* "*nion and* I *had* declined *Returning you* a Publick Answer, *they* "*would not presently have run away with full cry that* (*whatever* "*I might* Pretend, the only True Reason, *why I* did not, "*was because*) I Could not, or was Afraid *to, Answer you Publickly*? But now 'tis evident to the meanest Capacity, that for Persons to think *Well* of the *very same thing* in *One* man, which they would think *Ill* of in *Another* man, can be the Effect only of unreasonable, and therefore unjustifiable *Prejudice* and *Partiality*.

And as the Behaviour of the Generality of your Party is thus *Highly Blameable*, so this sort of Behaviour *in them*

who

who moved me to Do what I have Done, is further *Aggravated*, as being Accusable of *Insincerity* as well as Prejudice and Partiality. For, whatever specious Shew they made to me of being *Willing to have Matters in Debate fairly Discussed*, 'tis now apparent, that all the while they *meant no other* than what some of your Party have not been *Ashamed to Declare Openly* to this effect, viz. that *Let me Write what I would, they were Resolved to Continue as they Are*. However *God forbid that I should cease to Pray for* and *Endeavour* their Repentance and Amendment. And so I come to the Consideration of the Letter you, Sir, were pleased to *write to me*, which I shall consider (for the Reader's Ease) Paragraph by Paragraph.

A True Copy OF Mr. DOWLEY's LETTER TO Dr. WELLS,

Together with the Doctor's ANSWER.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

REVd. SIR

I Received 2 : printed letters from you, the one directed to some of your own parish, & the other perticularly to me, the meaning of your sending such thing: to me (of whom you have no knowledge but only by common fame) I can no otherwise interpret, but that either you are so conceited of your performance, that you think all the dissenters must needs be thunder strucke, fall down convinced at the sight of your papers, or else that you would invite me to write by way of answer to the subject of your letters:

Dr. WELLS's Answer.

That I have no other knowledge of you, Sir, but by common Fame (or what I have heard from Others, more especially your

your own Followers,) I readily allow: and surely you must allow, that this is Ground Enough and Enough to *Know you* to be a *Dissenting Teacher*, and *Him whom my Dissenting Parishioners follow*, and therefore Ground Enough to *Send you Such Things* as my *two printed Letters*. Pray *what things* could you reasonably expect I should Send you, but *Such Things*? Indeed I understand by *Common Fame*, that the more Affectionate of your Party frequently send you *Other Things*, which I easily imagine agree much better with your Stomach and Constitution, than *What I sent*. For 'tis pretty manifest from your own Letter, that *what I sent* did not *digest well*, but put you *Out of order*, and *Into a kind of Fever*: which is the Best Excuse that can be made for *your Uncharitable Interpretation* of the Meaning of my sending my Two Letters to you.

For your words are [*the meaning of your sending such things to me I can no otherwise interpret, but that either you are so conceited of your Performance &c.*] Now had you, Sir, but a very small portion of the *Charity* so much talked of by your Party, you would have been induced thereby to have *otherwise interpreted the Meaning of my sending such things to you*, and to have had some *more candid* Regard to my *Solemn Declarations*, that I had never troubled you or my Parishioners with my printed Letters, but in order (to do what in me lay) to *undeceive* you and them as to your *sinfull Errors and Practices*.

In short, Sir, I leave you or the most quick-sighted of your Followers to find out in Either of my Letters *One such downright unmannerly Personal Reflection*, as you are pleased out of *your sort of Charity and Moderation* to bestow upon me, viz. *Being Conceited with my Own Performance*. That you was a *Non-Conformist to the Rules of Church-Decency*, I knew indeed afore by *Common Fame*; but I confess I did not know, till I learnt so much from *your own Letter*, that you was likewise a *Non-Conformist to the Rules of Common-Civility and Good Manners*.

Well, but in what degree do you suppose me to be *Conceited of my Own Performance*? Why, so as to *think All the Dissenters must needs be Thunder-struck, and fall down Convinced*

as

at the Sight of my Papers. Truly, Sir, was my *Conceit* like this *your Expreſſion*, it would be *very High and Affected.* Pray don't *your Sermons* uſually run in this ſtrain of *Eloquence*? And may it not be well ſuppoſed, that 'tis on account of ſuch your Mighty and *Thunder-ſtriking* Expreſſions, that *your Hearers* by virtue of their *Unqueſtionable judgment* have Dubbed you with the Admired Title of a *Powerfull Teacher*?

As to the Diſſenters being *Thunder-ſtruck*, I heartily wiſh they did not give ſo Juſt occaſion to think that *they are ſo*, at leaſt as the Word is ſometimes uſed to denote, viz. Being *Deprived of Right Reaſon and Underſtanding.*

And as to the Diſſenters *Falling down Convinced at the* Sight *of my Papers*, you have unawares given an Intimation, that you well underſtand *how they are wont to be Convinced*, viz. *by Shew and Appearence, not by Reaſon and Argument.* Indeed I wiſh I had not Cauſe to Fear, that Some of them, if ever they *are Convinced*, muſt be ſo only *At the Sight of my Papers*; foraſmuch as they are ſo carried away with *Prejudice*, as Not to Afford my Papers the *Reading*, as they ought in Conſcience.

I ſhall now leave the World to judge, whether you are not a *very Bad and Uncharitable Interpreter* hitherto; and ſo proceed to your other Interpretation, that I would *Invite you to Write by way of Anſwer to the Subject of my Letters.* Sir, however you pleaſe to Deal with me, I ſhall be very careſull to do you Juſtice; and therefore freely own, that you are *in the Right* as to This Interpretation, as much as you were *in the Wrong* as to the Other. And I leave it to the Judgment of the Reader, whether you have alledged any tolerable Reaſon for *Not Writing and Publiſhing an Anſwer.* Let us ſee then what follows in your Letter.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

As to the former, I muſt truly ſay I meet with no conviction from them, but rather much confirmation in my judgement & practice, when I ſee ſuch a Mr. & Dr. of the Church coming forth in the defence of it, with ſo much ignorance weakneſs & miſtake, it

eſtabliſhes

establishes me that the truth is on our side, when one of such degree in the University has so little of moment to say against us.

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

As to your *meeting with no Conviction* &c. *from my Letters*, 'tis most Proper to refer it to the Determination of Impartial Judges, whether the True Cause thereof is to be ascribed to the *Weakness of my Arguments*, or to *the Strength of your Prejudice.*

I shall therefore only observe, that, had there been (in the Few Lines of your Letter immediately foregoing,) as much *Proof of what you lay to my Charge*, as there is Course, if not *Ill Language*; I am sure *I ought to have Blushed.* But since there is *only* very Course, not to say *Ill Language*, and *No Proof*; pray consider whether *you ought not to Blush.*

If my *Ignorance, Weakness*, and *Mistake be so Great* as you would have it thought, 'tis the *more Easy* for you to *Expose and Shew It*: and if I have *said so Little of Moment against you*, 'tis the *sooner Answered.* And therefore why will you let slip the Opportunity of a *Publick Victory and Triumph?* I dare say, and Others will be apt to think, that such your Conduct is no owing to *Any Kindness to Me.*

You would do well to call to mind, that an Army, which *keeps close within* it's Entrenchments, and *refuses* to joyn Battle in the *Open Field*, when 'tis *fairly offer'd* by the Opposite Side, is with very Good Reason counted to be *the Weakest in Reality*, how much soever it may *Decry the Enemy's Strength*, and *Boast of it's Own*, or whatever *Pretences* it may give out for so Acting. Whatever you please to think of *my Ignorance*, I will however be so Civil to you, Sir, as to suppose, that *your Ignorance* is not so Great, but that you know how to make *the Application to your self*; and therefore I shall go on to Consider the Reasons urged by you for *your not Publishing* an Answer to my Letters.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

And as to the other, many reasons with-hold me from writing publickly at this time, the Queens most excellent majesty hath so oft signified from the throne her desire that all her subjects should live in

love

love & peace, that I shall not lightly take up the bone of contention, persons should shew more manners to the government they live under, then to scatter strife when the royal authority calls them to unity & concord.

Dr. WELLS's *Answer.*

Since you say, Sir, that *Many Reasons With-hold you* &c. and are pleased to mention but three or four, which are *very far from being Good ones*; it may be well infer'd, that the Others must be *Extremely Bad ones*, and therefore you acted prudently in keeping them to your self. Besides, why do you intimate, that you are with-holden from Writing Publickly *at This time* more than you may be *at any Time hereafter* as long as you or I can probably expect to live?

Her most Excellent Majesty, as She hath *Often signified* Already, so I heartily pray God that She may Live *Often Again to Signify from the Throne Her most* highly Commendable *Desire that All her Subjects should live in Love and Peace, Unity and Concord.* And sure I am that the *Only Design of my Letters* was to *Promote Love and Peace, Unity and Concord*, by Endeavouring what I could to Remove the *Chief Occasion* of our Unhappy Discords. If my Letters have a Contrary Effect *on you, the Fault is only yours*; if *you* cannot return *an Answer* without an *Unchristian Contention*, or with the like *Meekness* and *Calmness* as *my Letters* were written with, 'tis the *Unhappiness of your Temper*. But pray had it not been more for your Credit, to have Concealed this your Unhappiness of Temper, than to have thus Discovered, that 'tis impossible for you to *Answer*, without Snarling like a Dog about a *Bone*?

As to the *Admonition* you take upon you to give, I know No One in All these Parts that stands in need of it, but only *your self*; and therefore be pleased *to Do* as Well as *Say*, and to *Practise* as one that *knows* that *Persons should shew more Manners to the Government they live under, than to* Propagate and *Scatter Strife*, and keep up Unnecessary and Sinfull Divisions by their Separate Congregations, *when the Royal Authority calls them to Unity and Concord*, and therefore more especially to *Church-Unity*, as being the most principal and the only true Basis of All Other Unity whatever.

I might

I might instance, Sir, in other Respects, wherein you fall short of *shewing Manners to the Government*, forasmuch as you *abuse it's Gracious Clemency* towards you, by going about among your Followers to Pervert and *Wrest* the *Toleration* and *Not-Passing of the Occasional Bill*, into an Argument, that *your Separation is approved of by the Government.* I omit also another instance, which might shew, that whatever Respect you pretend to have for the *Government*, you have however much Greater Respect for *your Money.* And would it please God to Enable you by his Grace to *Despise* these two Particulars, *Money* and *Temporal Interest*, I should have Great Hopes of your being *Still Convinced by my Letters* or some such other Means.

This, Sir, is Enough to Shew the Weakness and Insufficiency of your First Reason for *Not writing Publickly at this Time.* Go we on to your second Reason.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

There is enough writ on the subject allready to satisfye those that are willing to receive light, and those that willfully shut their eyes I shall have no hope to enlighten, by any thing that may be farther said, had you perused the dissenters defence of themselves published by Dr Owen Mr Baxter Mr Clarkson Mr Alsop & diverse others, you might have seen your self answered before you wrote, and therefore it's needless to write again, till something of worth not considered is brought forth, of which sort I see nothing in your letters.

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

I may as easily *Deny* as you, Sir, *Affirm*, that *there is Enough Writ* (I mean) *on your side already to Satisfie those that are Willing to receive light.* And I assure you, that *I do not willfully shut my eyes*, and therefore *you may have hope to Enlighten me, by Any thing* that you shall please to *say Further* and Conducive to that End.

As for the Writings of the Dissenters, Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Baxter*, Mr. *Clarkson*, Mr. *Alsop* &c. it might be Enough to Reply, that had you perused Dr. *Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation*, and the *Cases of the London Divines*, or the *Abridgement* of them, and other Treatises of *our Writers* publish'd

publish'd *since* the Writings you refer to; *you might have seen that I could not see my self answer'd before I wrote*, and therefore that *'tis not needless for you to write* still. But I rather choose to alledge, that tho' you may be so *Partial* as *never to Look* into any of Our Writers, yet *I may know more* of your writers than you may imagine, and I had (by God's Blessing) given you a Publick Proof thereof by this time, had I not been called off to this Consideration of your Letter. On which account I must desire your Patience a little longer for that Tract, which, when it comes forth, will be a Further Evidence that I could *not see my self Answer'd before I wrote*, and that *'tis not needless for you to write*, since there is *something brought forth in my Letters* of so much *Worth*, as to be *Owned and Maintained as True* by the forementionʼd Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Baxter*, &c. tho' *Denied*, and *Not Practised by you and your Followers.*

Thus you may see, if *you will not shut your eyes*, that neither will your second Reason acquit you *from Writing Publickly at this time by way of Answer to my Letters.* Take we now the third Reason under Consideration.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

The case of that unhappy Gent: (the author of the book herewith inclosed) abundantly shews what disadvantage the dissenters lye under in writing, though never so much called upon & provoked thereto, they have been answered with prisons & penalties & not with arguments, and therefore there is not room for them to write so freely and fully on their case as the matter would lead them, and as their adversaries may against them, they may say tolle legem & fiat disputatio; *but while things are so hedged about with penal laws it is not safe for them to write.*

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

Mr. *De Laune* was indeed very *Unhappy* (not only as to the Misfortune of his Latter end, but also) as to his Principles and Practices, and particularly as to his *Plea for the Non-Conformists*, it being One of the *Meanest* pieces even of that kind, and therefore methinks you have *Disparaged your Judgment* in choosing to send me *that Book* before some

some other of your own Writers. Sir, I can assure you that I had (afore I received that which you sent) perused within this Twelve-month the said Book; and that I perused it *more carefully than your self*, I believe I can subjoin so Good a Proof as will amount to a *Demonstration*. For had you ever Read but the *very first page* in the Book after the Title-leaf, you must there have found at the Bottom of the page a *Plain Direct Contradiction* to what you so Confidently affirm in the part of your Letter last cited, as will appear by placing *what you say* and *what is there said* together side by side thus,

Mr. *Dowley*'s Words.	The *Publisher* (of Mr. *De Laune*)'s Words.
There is not Room for them (i. e. the Dissenters) *to Write so Freely and Fully on their Case as the Master would lead them, and as their Adversaries may against them. They may say,* Tolle legem & fiat Disputatio, *but while things are so Hedged about with Penal Laws, it is not Safe for them to Write.*	*Blessed be God, We now live in a more Mild and Gentle Reign; in which it will not be accounted Criminal for Men in a Sober and Modest manner, to Declare the Grounds and Reasons of their Faith.*

Don't you see, Sir, what an Extraordinary *Agreement* there is between what is said in *your Letter*, and *in the Book* you sent with it? If what you have chosen and sent me to be *your own Evidence*, will thus *give in Witness Against you*; and what you design'd to be *your own Voucher* will thus flatly *Give you the Ly*, I cannot Help it, and you can Blame only your own Imprudence and Disingenuity in making use of such Fallacious Arguments.

Certainly, Sir, had you not *too much Relied* on my Ignorance, you would not have ventur'd to Argue at this strange rate, viz. "*Mr.* De Laune *and the other* Dissenters "*could not Write with Freedom and Safety in their own Defence* "*when they incurr'd the Punishments* once *annexed to the breach* "*of the Penal Laws: Therefore I* Mr. Dowley *cannot write* "*with Freedom and Safety in my Own Defence* Now *when the*

"*Penal*

" *Penal Laws are disarm'd of their Sanction, that the Dissenters*
" *incur no Penalties by the Violation of them; but Liberty of the*
" Press *as well as of* Conscience *is Granted to them.* Had I never enjoy'd the Happiness of an *University-Education*, yet my own *Natural Reason* would of it self have Enabled me to Discover the *Falseness* of your foregoing Argument. And I dare say you were Bred at a *Separate* (if at *Any*) Academy: forasmuch as from your way of Arguing all along your Letter, it may be well inferr'd, that you are a *Dissenter* from the *Established* Rules of *Reason* as well as *Religion*.

Moreover, is it not evident from this Instance, that *you*, Sir, *your self* (as well as your Followers) are sometimes *Convinced* only *at the Sight of Papers* and Books? For had you gone but one Page beyond the Title-Page of Mr. *De Laune's Plea*, you must have found the forementioned *flat contradiction* to what you say in your Letter. And therefore may it not be very reasonably inferred, that you (Good man, out of *your sincere Impartiality*) troubled your self to look no further, but presently *Fell down Convinced* (only *at the Sight of the Title* to Mr. *De Laune's* Book) that what followed was without all doubt Answerable thereunto, and so a sufficient *Plea for the Non-Conformists*? On this account I must beg leave to put *this Question* to you, whether you are not *Convinced after the same manner*, that the Works of Dr. *Owen*, Mr. *Baxter* &c. are Just *Defences of your Separation*, namely, because you have *Seen*, or perhaps only *Heard* of, some such Title to their Books? And hence *your Followers* may (and Others will) gather, what *little Stress or Heed* is to be given to *your Recommendation* of a Book, since your Knowledge of It may be thus well suspected to be no other, than what may be most properly called only *Superficial*.

It appears then from what has been said, that what you mention in your Letter as the third Argument for your *Not Writing Publickly* is (even by the Testimony of the *very Book you sent* with it and *Appeal* to) a *Downright Untruth*, and so No Argument. And therefore it appears also, that you might very well have Spared that Scrap of *Latin*, *Tolle Legem & fiat Disputatio*; there being no manner of Occasion for it, unless you would have it looked

looked upon as an Evidence of your *Great skill in the Latin Tongue.* And if so, why did you not add likewise a Scrap of *Greek* and *Hebrew* for Proofs of *your Profound Learning* in those Two Languages?

Lastly, in reference to this Part of your Letter I cannot but again put you in mind of *your own Admonition* abovemention'd, and desire you to consider, whether you do not *Shew very Little manners to the Government,* whilst (instead of *Returning Due Thanks* for the *Great Liberty* graciously indulged to your Party) you still continue on your old *Murmurings* and *Complaints*, that *you are* (after All that is Already done for you) *too much Hedged in with Penal Laws.* Sir, hereby you make it pretty plain, *What* you would be *At*; *What is the Time* you stay in expectation of, *for to Write Publickly in*; and of *What Stamp* or *Sort* of Dissenters you are of. But pray, *What liberty* will *Content* you? you have heard above from One of your own Brethren, that you may *Now Write Freely* and *Safely in a Sober and Modest manner.* And is not that Enough? No; for it seems you are *of such a Temper*, that you *cannot Confine your Pen* within the Narrow Bounds of *Sobriety* and *Modesty.*

'Tis time then now to proceed to your last pretended Reason for *Not Answering me Publickly.*

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

What is matter of argument in your papers (*which is but little*) *is mainly the same that the papists plead against the protestants, and what you would replye to them in the defence of the reformation, you may answer your selfe withall as to the most you have to say against us, upon the same principles that you can justifie your selves against Rome, we can justifie our selves against you, your pretending to make us false teachers for opposing your ceremonies* (*which is all the evidence you give in that point*) *lays you open to the papists to prove you the same for your leaving any of theirs.*

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

In this paragraph you do, Sir, much as Children are wont to do, when they go about to save themselves from

telling a *downright Ly*, by adding to what they say an [Almost] or the like. For what else is the design of your slipping in [Mainly] in one place, and in another [as to the most] but to keep your self off as well as you could from maintaining a *Notorious Untruth*, and yet to seem to say Something, which however amounts at last to *Nothing*.

For *We defend our Reformation, and justify our selves against Rome*, by proving that the *Roman* Church imposes *Sinfull* Terms of Communion, such as the *Belief of Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Worshipping of Saints and Images* &c. But how can you have the Face to say, that *you can justify your selves Against Us* on the like account? Doth our Church impose *such or any other Sinfull* Term of Communion? Have I not under the *Fourth Head* of my *First Letter* particularly consider'd the Common Objections made by your Party, and prov'd that *Nothing that you object against us is Sinfull*? And therefore it lies upon you to Disprove what I have there said.

Again, Sir, how can you so Confidently affirm that *All the Evidence I give as to the point of your being a False Teacher*, is taken from your *Opposing Ceremonies*? Either you have not Read *the Second Head of my Letter to your self*, or else you must know that I prove you to be a *False Teacher* on account also of your Teaching by a *False Mission*. And what I have said hereupon, you are to *Disprove*, before *you can justify your self against Us, by the same Principles We justify our selves against the Papists*.

Nay, under the *First* Head of my Letter to your self, I prove you to be a *False Teacher* on account of *Falseness of Doctrine*, in *Opposing* the Obedience due to the Governours of the Church in things lawfull, and in *Teaching* or *incouraging* the People to leave their true and rightfull Ministers, and to follow you out of a wrong opinion of your being *more Gifted*, and in other Points, which surely are *more than Ceremonies*. And therefore your *Opposing Ceremonies* is not the *only evidence I give in* for to make you a False Teacher.

I do indeed under *the First Head* of my Second Letter instance in some *Ceremonies*, as *Kneeling* &c. And surely whosoever

whosoever *Opposes* even a bare *Ceremony* so, as to maintain it to be Sinfull, when the Scripture says no such thing, but even approves of it, is so far forth a *False Teacher*. Nor does the *Church of England* do so in respect of *Any such Ceremony* used by the *Church of Rome*: and therefore 'tis a very false Assertion to say, that *the Papists may prove Us False Teachers for Leaving Any of their Ceremonies by the same Reasons, that we prove you to be False Teachers for Opposing our Ceremonies.*

And thus I have shewn the Insufficiency of your fourth and last Reason for *Not Writing Publickly*. Next for your Inference from All taken together.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

For these considerations I forbear at present appearing in print on this head, and though you shall burden the presse with your letters answerable to the months of the year, yet I assure you (without greater occasion appear) you shall faile of your expectation of drawing me to the presse on that matter; not but that you have allready given abundant room and advantage to expose your nakedness, as the few following hints may serve for as the rest.

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

I have, Sir, Letters by me, which as plainly testify that *my Letters* have been *No Burdens to the Press*, as your own Letter testifies them to be Heavy *Burdens to you*, who act like One that *wanting Strength to bear his Burden* as he ought, or at least to *Ease himself of it Handsomely*, without any more ado *Flings it off* in a great Passion.

But pray, Sir, what *Greater Occasion* would you have *appear to Draw you to the Press*? As for the *Considerations* you have mention'd for your *Forbearing at present to appear in print*, let the Impartial Reader Judge, whether they have not been already proved to be *No Considerations*; and as for the few *Arguments* you offer below in reference to the Controversy between us, let the same Reader also judge, whether they are not there proved to be *No Arguments*.

Besides, Sir, you your self mention a *very Good Occasion*

to Draw you to the Press, were it so as you say, viz. that *I have given Abundant room and advantage to expose my nakedness*. I am much afraid, lest your Own Conscience tells you, that you do not *really Think* so as you have *Writ*; for else I dare say you would not refuse to *Take* what is *Given* you: and (pray) Confess ingenuously, whether this be not the *very first time*, that ever you did Refuse to *Take a Gift*?

Well, but though you think not fit to *take Advantage* of me *Publickly*, or to *Print a Full Answer* to my Letters; yet you are willing *Privately* to let me see, what you *Could* do with me, if you *would*, by the Few *following Hints*, which are such Extraordinary Feats as that they *may serve for All the Rest*. Now then for *Dints of Argument*.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

You seem to glory in christs example of prayer in his agony, as your Achilles to justifie formes in that duty, whereas really nothing doth make more against them, for it is evident christ prayed then according to the present occasion and exercise of his spirit, and so indeed all prayer ought to be and all that we read of in scripture really was so, but no printed formes can reach all occasions that may happen, not those whose perfection is so much cryed up by the admirers of them, for upon all new publicke occasions there are still new ones made: christs using the same words the 3 severall times he prayed upon that head of his sufferings, makes nothing for you, for that may be and often is used in extempore prayer, expressing the desire by the same words, when there is occasion to pray oft for the same mercy, and you may as well argue from christs preaching to have formes of sermons, as from his praying to have such in that duty, for he oft repeated the same expressions in his doctrine as well as in his devotion, as may be seen Math: 5: 21: 27: 33: 38: v: & chapt: 23: 13: 14: 15: 25: 27: 29: vs:.

Dr. Wells's *Answer*.

You threat'ned, Sir, to give some *few Hints*, how you could *Expose my Nakedness*: but All such Readers as are capable of understanding the Oddness of the Expression, will (I am apt to believe) think that you have in the

very next Sentence notoriously *Exposed your Own Nakedness*, by introducing the mention of *Achilles* after so absurd and ridiculous a manner. May I ask, how oft you have used this *Fine Expression* in your Discourses to your Hearers, telling them, that they ought to Glory in Christ's Example *as their* Achilles? How oft soever you have used it, doubtless it could not but carry along with it a Great Deal of *Edification*; and it may very well serve for a Shrewd *Hint*, How justly you Deserve the Title of an *Edifying Preacher*. May not One be induced hereby to Imagine, that, notwithstanding the Out-cry you make against *Popish Unscriptural Saints*, there are also some *Puritan Unscriptural Saints*, among whom this same *Achilles* is esteemed by you as Chief, or rather more than a Saint, or Christ himself? For surely in your Comparison *Achilles* has plainly the Pre-eminence given him even before *our Blessed Saviour*, and is represented as a *more Extraordinary Person*. What a Strange Surprize then must it be to such of your Followers as have heard you use this Expression, to be Undeceived and told that this same *Achilles* (if not a *Puritan Saint* commonly unknown, but *That* spoken of in common Authors) was no other than a *Pagan* or *Heathen Hero* or Great Warrior; and consequently that this your Expression may be Justly Censured as being in some sort *Irreligious and Prophane*!

In short, the chief Reason I can think of for your thus pulling in (as it were by the Head and Shoulders) the Pagan or Heathen *Achilles*, is this, that you had a mind to shew, how much *more Learned* your are than *such a Minister and Doctor of the Church* as my self; and that you are extremely well Read in *Homer* and other *Greek* Authors. But I must beg leave to observe, that had you been pleased to have contrived some occasion for introducing the mention of the *Greek* Word or Name writ in it's proper or *Greek* Letters, it would have been somewhat a *Better Hint* of your *Vast Skill in the* Greek Tongue.

Thus much for the *Manner* of your Expression; let us now consider what you *Aim at* thereby; and the *Meaning* thereof, as well as I can guess, must be in *Plain En-*

gliſh to this Effect, viz. that *I ſeem to Glory in Chriſt's example of Prayer in his Agony, as* a main Argument *to juſtify Forms in that Duty.* Sir, you need not have ſaid, that *I ſeem to Glory*, for I am not Aſhamed readily to Own, that I do Actually *Glory in Chriſt's Example*, and that *becauſe it is Chriſt's Example*, and ſo the *Greateſt* that a True Chriſtian *can Glory in*, and of the Greateſt Authority *to juſtify Forms of Prayer.*

You ſay indeed that *there is really Nothing that makes more Againſt Forms than Chriſt's Prayer in his Agony.* But then you are pleaſed only to *ſay ſo*, and immediately to ſubjoyn (to ſave me the Labour) a very good Proof of the Falſhood of what you had ſaid juſt afore. *For* (add you,) *it is Evident Chriſt prayed then according to the Preſent Occaſion*: and may not I as truly add, that ſo likewiſe *Our Forms* of Prayer are Suitable or *According to the Preſent Occaſion* when they are uſed? You farther add, that Chriſt then prayed according to *the Exerciſe of his Spirit.* Now I have obſerved (p. 19, 20. of my Letter to a Diſſenting Pariſhioner) that by this and the like Expreſſions Can be meant but One of theſe two things, either *Making a New Prayer by the Aſſiſtance of the Spirit*, or *Saying a Prayer already made with a Spiritual Devotion.* In the former ſenſe our Saviour could then pray but *only the firſt time*; the *two other times* He cannot poſſibly be ſaid *to pray according to the Exerciſe of his Spirit* any other ways than in the latter ſenſe of the Words, or as it denotes to *pray* or *repeat a prayer with the Spirit of Devotion.* In like manner our *Common Prayer* may (conſidering the Great Piety of the Compilers of It, and with what Due Preparation they ſet about the Work, by Earneſtly Praying God for his Special Aſſiſtance therein) juſtly be eſteemed as *Firſt Drawn up or Made by the Aſſiſtance of the Spirit*; and whoſoever *Rightly* uſes it *ever ſince*, may be truly ſaid to *Pray according to the Exerciſe of his Spirit* or *Spiritual Devotion.* And thus you may ſee if you do not ſhut cloſe your eyes, that *even according to your Own Account* there is an Excellent *Agreement* between *Chriſt's Prayer* in his Agony and *our Forms of Prayer.*

But (go you on) *No Stinted Forms can reach All Occaſions* that

that may happen. Sir, I have had (perhaps you may call it) the Misfortune to be so much used (by that Sort of Study which I take a peculiar Delight in) to *Connexion*, that I cannot get over this same little Particle [But] without considering how it comes in here, which is thus: say you, *Nothing really makes more against Forms than Christ's Prayer in his Agony*; then for proof hereof you add, *For Christ then prayed according to the Present Occasion, But no Stinted Forms can reach All Occasions*, Therefore (— What? will it follow that) *No Stinted Form can be According to the Present Occasion*: This surely will never follow by Any Rules of *Logick* or *Right Reasoning*. Pray then, Sir, give me leave now to give you a *Kind Admonition*, viz. that How much soever you may think fit to *Despise Logick in your Discourses to your Hearers*; yet whenever you *Write to Others*, or think fit to *Appear in Print*, you would be pleased to have more Regard to the *Rules* (tho' they be likewise *Stinted Forms*) of *Syllogism*. By these you might have perceived that a *Stinted Form*, tho' it may not *reach All Occasions*, yet it may be very well used *According* to a *Present Occasion*. Nay, you might have perceived, that what you say in this respect *Against Stinted Forms*, holds as much *Against our Saviour's Prayer in his Agony*: for tho' it was then *according to the Present Occasion*, yet surely you will Own that It will *Not Reach All Occasions*. Nay, this your Objection makes as much *against Extempore Prayer* as *Stinted Forms*: for surely you will Allow that even the *same Extempore Prayer* will *Not Reach All Occasions*; otherwise why do you make *New Prayers* so very Often? And therefore pray see into what strange Difficulties you run your self; For 1*st*. you require to a *Good Prayer* Two Qualities, which are *utterly Inconsistent* the One with the Other, viz. To be *Peculiar to One Present Occasion*, and yet to *Reach All Occasions*.

2. You make the Addition of a *Few New Occasional* Prayers twice or thrice in the whole year to be a token of *Great Imperfection* in *Our Forms*; and yet Cry up *Newness of Prayer* used every time you *Meet* as a token of the *Greatest Perfection* in *your Extempore Prayer*. And now can Men be

guilty of *Greater Contradictions* than *you* and *your Party* are in this Case? Or can there be a clearer Evidence of you and your Party being *quite Blinded* with *Prejudice* and *Partiality*, than your not being Able to *Discern your so Apparent Self-Contradiction*?

And yet *your Own Blindness* in this Case will appear still more by what follows in your Letter. For tho' you say indeed, that *Christ's using the same words the three several times* &c. *makes Nothing for Us*, yet you are again unwittingly so very Complaisant as to *Prove the Contrary* by adding, that *this may be, and oft is used in Extempore Prayer, expressing the Desire by the Same Words, when there is Occasion to Pray oft for the same Mercy.* For herein you imply as Good an Argument as can be Desired for *Forms*, which stands thus; "*When* there is Occasion to *Pray* for the *same Mercies*, *then* "*the Desire* may be expresst by the *same Words*: But there is "Occasion to *Pray Daily* for the *same* (viz. Common) *Mer-*"*cies*: Therefore the *Desire* may be expresst *Daily* by the "*same Words*". This, Sir, is no other in effect than your Own Argument, and 'tis indeed an Unanswerable One, namely *Not Against*, but *For the Use of Forms*; forasmuch as to *Express the Desire Daily by the same Words*, is the same as to *Use Daily the same Form of Prayer.*

Nay, this your Argument will Prove not only the Lawfullness of *Forms in general*, but also the Lawfullness of *Repeating some Parts of Them several Times*, and so affords a *very Good Answer* to that *Weak Objection* made by some of your Writers *Against the Repetition* of the *Lord's Prayer* &c. in our Liturgy.

By this time you begin (I suppose) to Perceive, *whither* you are Got, and how the Stream of *Truth* has been so strong as to have forced you without your own Will *On our Side*, and to write *For Sainted Forms*, even when you designed to write *Against* them. It concerns you to take care and clear your self among *your Brethren*, least they begin to suspect that, tho' you pretend *Outwardly* that you have *met with no Conviction in my Papers*, yet you are *Inwardly Convinced* so far, as to pretend to write *in Defence of their Cause* only, that you might the *Better Betray*

tray it, and Expose or Lay Open the *Weakness* and *Badness* of it.

As to what follows in your Letter, concerning *Arguing to have Forms of Sermons from Christ's Repeating the same Expressions in his Doctrine &c.* it is so very Extravagant, as that it serves only to Argue that you are not very Good at *Argumentation*; since there is by no means a just Parallel between the Instance I make use of for *Forms of Prayer*, and the Instances mentioned by you for *Forms of Sermons*. Nay, if your way of *Arguing* holds good, you may run your self before you are aware into another *Noose* or *Snare*, and prove that *you your self Preach by Form*, if so be you keep to the *Method* of *Doctrine*, *Division*, *Use &c.* But perhaps you are so *Averse to Forms*, that you take particular Care, that *your Discourses* should be *Far enough* from having Any thing of *Doctrine* or *Use*, or *Any Method* at all.

But tho' what you alledge, is *no Good Argument* for *Forms of Sermons*; yet I assure you, I am by no means *Against them*; but on the contrary have *a very great Opinion of them*, as well as of *Forms of Prayer*. For I think it might be of *Great Benefit*, and *Prevent a Great Deal of Mischief*, was there *a Book of Sermons* drawn up by Judicious Persons *on All Subjects fit for Common Auditories*, and *All Ministers* or *Teachers Obliged to Use them*, unless on some *Special* Occasions. And to such an *Injunction* I should willingly *submit*, and so testify that *I am not so Conceited of my Own Performances*, as *Another* may be, who thinks me so, and would be apt *to refuse such a Submission*, whether out of *Humility* let others judge.

Thus have I largely shewn *the Great Weakness* of *your Objections against my Arguments for Forms* drawn from our Saviour's *Prayer in his Agony*. You go on next to *your Objections* against *my Arguments for Forms*, drawn from the *Lord's Prayer*; and I shall attend you, and give them their Due Consideration.

Mr. DOWLEY's Letter.

You likewise insist much on the Lords prayer given to the disciples, thinking you have thereby convincing proofe for forms,

whereas

whereas for ought you have said on that head, that may rather be taken as a directory than a forme, the different relation of it by the 2. Evangelists may signifie so much, and the Apostles practice may confirm those thoughts, of whom we never read in scripture that they used it in the set words, but suited their expressions in prayer to their severall occasions, as the spirit gave them vtterance, as may be seen. Acts 1: 24: 25: *Chapt* 4: 24: *to the* 30*th. and more-over the subject matter of that prayer will backe this sense, for if it be enjoind to all that profess the name of Christ to use in the set words, then multitudes are commanded to speake falsely, to call god in heaven their father, when they are of their father the Divel in hell, as Christ told the Jews notwithstanding their profession and claim of god as their father John* 8, *and I wonder how men of violent spirits can say the prayer, beging for forgiveness as they forgive others, when indeed they are full of rage and fury, and far from any forgiving temper;*

Dr. WELLS's *Answer.*

Instead of *barely affirming*, that *the Lord's Prayer* may rather be taken as a *Directory* than a *Pattern*, *for ought I have said on that head*; you should have some way or other *Disproved* the Reasons I have alledged to that purpose; particularly you should have *disproved*, that those words of our Saviour, *When ye pray, Say, Our Father &c.* do come up to the very Same as if he had said, *When ye pray say this Form, Our Father &c.* And if when our Saviour thus plainly intimates, that it is a *Form*, you will nevertheless boldly *gainsay* it, I cannot expect that you should have due Regard to Any thing I can offer, when you refuse to have due Regard to what our Saviour himself has said.

The *Different relations given by the two Evangelists* are so far from Disproving the *Lord's Prayer* to be a *Form*, that they mightily Confirm it; forasmuch as they prove, that this Prayer was prescribed by our Saviour *at two different places*, and so *at two different times*. If by the *different relation of It* you refer to that Little *Difference of Expression* which is to be found in the *two Evangelists*, you might have perceived that this can be no material Objection, had you but consi-

dered,

dered, that *our Saviour* did not deliver his Prayer in the *Greek Tongue*, and that the *different Translation of a Form* out of One tongue into Another cannot possibly prove it to be *No Form*. And as to the Omission of the *Doxology* in St. *Luke*, that can only Prove, that the said *Doxology* (as not being *Properly* a part of the *Prayer*) may be *omitted* or *added* by *our Saviour's* own permission; and agreeably hereunto you may see in *our Liturgy*, that the *Lord's Prayer* is there appointed to be repeated sometimes *with*, sometimes *without* the Doxology. In short, if *such a Difference of Expression*, or *such an Omission* as is above specified, will make what was *designed to be a Form* to become *No Form*, then you must allow also *Our Common Prayer* to be *No Form*, since there are several Parts of It to be sometimes *Omitted*, and at other times *Inserted*, and since it is but saying *Most Mighty* instead of *Almighty* or the like, and it ceases to be *a Form*. And if so, then you are to *Invent* new pretended Reasons to *Excuse* your self from *Not Complying* with It; since your Objection against it as *a Form* will no longer hold, if this last Objection holds Good. And thus by the way you may further see the Badness of your Cause, when the Objections, which you are forced to take up with, *Destroy One the Other*.

I could add a great deal more still for the further confirmation of this matter, which you might have found in *Our Writers* upon this Subject, and so *seen your self fully Answered herein afore you wrote*. Neither will I barely Say this, but refer you to some particular Treatises, viz. *Certain Cases of Conscience resolved concerning the Lawfulness of Joyning with Forms of Prayer*, Part. 2. Cas. 5. in Vol. 2d. of London-Divines Cases; or else in the *Abridgment of them* Ch. 3. or in Dr. *Whitby's Annotations* on Matth. 6. 9. &c.

In the forecited Places of each of the said Books you might likewise *have seen your self fully Answered afore you wrote*, as to what comes next in your Letter, viz. that *the Apostles Practice may* (you dare not speak out so great an Untruth, as to say, *the Apostles Practice doth*) confirm the Opinion of the *Lord's Prayer* being only a *Directory*, forasmuch as *we never read in Scripture that they used It in set words*,

words, but ſuited their expreſſions in prayer to their ſeveral occaſions, as the ſpirit gave them utterance. For in the forementioned Books you would have been taught, that what St. John ſaith of Chriſt, viz. that there were *many things which Jeſus did, which were not written*, holds true alſo of the Apoſtles: and that you may as well conclude from the *Silence* of the Scripture, that the Apoſtles did *not Baptize in the name of the Father &c.* that they *never prayed before Chriſt's Reſurrection*; that many of them *never preached the Goſpel &c.* as that they *never uſed the Lord's Prayer*. And as to the Gift of *Utterance* you might have learnt from the Books abovementioned, that "it was *Miraculous* and Particular to the "*Primitive* Age; that you may as well pretend to the Gift "of *Tongues*, as that of *Utterance*; and that if your Prayers "are thus *Inſpired* as thoſe of the Apoſtles were, they muſt "be of *Equal Authority* with *the Scripture*; which even the "*Sober Diſſenters* themſelves will not maintain, but diſavow.

I confeſs that I cannot refer you to the forementioned, or any other Books for an Anſwer to *your next Objection*, (methinks you begin to *Think highly of It* hereupon, but there is no ſuch Occaſion, this happening) *Not* becauſe It is *ſo Good* as to be *Unanſwerable*, but becauſe It is *ſo very Bad* and *Extravagantly Abſurd*, as that I know of *No One* of your own Party *ſo very Weak* as to *Make Uſe of It*, but *your ſelf*; and now you have brought It forth, it is really *not Worth an Anſwer*. However in *Civility* to you I will not paſs it by *wholly Unregarded*; but ſhall put you in mind, that you would have done well to have Conſidered, that ſuppoſing the *Lord's Prayer* to have been enjoyned (not *to All that* profeſs the name of Chriſt, but) only to *True Chriſtians* to uſe in the *ſet Words*, yet this had been abundantly enough to have proved the *ſaid Prayer* to have been deſigned for a *Form*; inaſmuch as a *Form* that is uſed but by *Ten*, is *as much a Form as* if it was uſed by *Ten Thouſand*. Again you would have done well to have Conſidered, that this ſame Objection of yours, if it holds *Good*, makes it Unwarrantable for *Multitudes of Chriſtians* to ſay not only the *Lord's Prayer*, but *Any Other Whatever*. Once more you would have done well to have Conſidered,

sidered, that this your Objection carries in it a *most severe Reflexion* on a *Certain Dissenting Teacher* and his *most Zealous Followers*. For say you, *No one is commanded to say the Lord's Prayer, that is a Child, not of God, but of the Devil*: Now 'Tis notoriously known, that a *Certain Dissenting Teacher* and *his most Zealous Followers never say the Lord's Prayer*. Therefore is it not a Natural Consequence, that the said *Certain Dissenting Teacher* and *his Followers* make themselves to be *Children, not of God, but of the Devil*? In like manner say you, *No One is Commanded to say the Lord's Prayer, that is full of Rage and Fury, and Far from a Forgiving Temper*. To which may be subjoyned, *a Certain Dissenting Teacher &c. never says the Lord's Prayer*; Therefore may it not be naturally inferred, that *the said Dissenting Teacher &c. is Full of Rage and Fury, and Far from a Forgiving Temper*? Now if Any One will cast such severe Reflexions on himself &c. who shall Help it, or with whom can he be Angry in justice, but only with *himself*, for Not acting more *Discreetly* and *Uprightly*?

Well, but you have Still in reserve Another Objection against *Forms*, supposing those already drawn from the *Lord's Prayer* will *not Hold*; which is as follows.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

But suppose it as you say that it was given by Christ as a set form, what is that to other devised ones, because Christ the head of the Church and lawgiver might give his disciples a set short form, it doth not therefore follow that the servants may do so too, if there were no further imposition then what christ hath made you would have no quarrell with the dissenters; so that from all your arguing from scripture there doth not appear there any warrant for formes, and therefore those that say so are not false teachers but ministers of truth, and those that say the contrary may more easily be laid under that denomination.

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

You needed not, Sir, to have given your self the trouble of *making the Objection* contained in this last paragraph; nor me the trouble of *Answering* it, since you

might,

might alſo *have ſeen this fully Anſwered afore you wrote*, had you conſulted the forecited places of the two firſt Books above mentioned; or had you been but pleaſed to have duely Conſidered *the firſt head* of my *Firſt Letter*. For you might thence have learnt, that what *Chriſt* thought good to preſcribe to his Church for its benefit, the Same or like without all doubt may be preſcribed by *Such of his Servants*, as He has *entruſted the Government of his Church with*. And alſo you might have learnt, that *All Impoſitions*, which *Such his Servants* think fit to make in things *not Forbidden*, are to be look'd upon and obey'd as *Chriſt's own Impoſitions*, and therefore that the *Diſſenters* have no juſt reaſon to *Quarrel* with us.

I cannot well conceive, why you ſhould give ſuch a particular intimation of the *Shortneſs* of the *Lord's Prayer*, unleſs you deſign it by way of *Hint*, that *our Set Form* is *too long*. But then this *Hint* will ſerve alſo for an *Hint* of *your Self-Contradiction*, whilſt you *blame* our *Common Prayer* on that very Same account, whereby you endeavour to *Recommend*, and for which your Party are wont to *Cry up*, your *Extempore Prayers*, namely for the *Length* of them. As for what follows in your laſt paragraph, it is an *Hint*, that *you* (as well as ſome of your Followers) *are Reſolved* that, let me *Write* or *Say* what I will, *never ſo much or ſo clear Truth*, yet you will have *no Regard to It*. I ſhall therefore only add, that if you will but have *Any Regard* (tho' not to *Me*, yet) to Some of the *moſt Eminent of your Own Writers*, and to the Univerſal Judgment of *All the Reformed Churches* beyond the Seas, you muſt acknowledge (as will appear in my next Treatiſe) that *there is in Scripture ſufficient warrant for Forms*, and therefore *thoſe that ſay there doth not* appear ſuch warrant, are juſtly chargeable with being *Falſe Teachers on that account*.

Thus much for what you ſay by way of *Objection Againſt* my Argument *to juſtify Forms* of Prayer: you go on next to ſay Something in *defence of Extempore* Prayer.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

Before you declaime ſo loudly againſt extempore prayer you would

would do well to clear your self of those scriptures that plainly hold it forth as Rom: 8: 26: 27: where the Apostle sets forth the Spirit helping our infirmitys in the matter as well as in the manner of that duty, which would be altogether needless if we be tied to a forme before our eyes, where the matter is limited & known beforehand, & he also saith the Spirit so works sometimes in the children of god in that duty, as that it cannot be uttered, but its easie to utter a forme that is before us; & before you so wholly runn down this way of praying you would do well to answer bishop Wilkins upon that subjet, who p: 12: saith, that to despise it, & use reproachfull expressions about it, is for the most part a signe of a prophane heart, & of persons being strangers to the power & comfort of the duty; And also you should be agreed among your selves of its sinfullness, for many of your own communion practise it, & your arguing will make them as much false teachers as us.

Dr. WELLS's *Answer.*

Would you, Sir, but have given your self leave duely to have considered what I say in my Letters concerning *Extempore* Prayer, you would have perceived that All this last paragraph of your Letter is *Nothing at all* to the purpose.

For first, All that is said in my Letter relates to *Extempore Prayer in Publick*: and I leave Any one of Common Capacity to judge, whether *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. can possibly be understood of *Publick Extempore* Prayer. For as the Apostle saith in the former part of the verse, that *the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities*, so in the latter part he tells us how it doth so, viz. by *interceeding for Us with Groanings that Cannot be Uttered.* But now can such Groanings as *Cannot be Uttered* be applied to *the Matter* of *Publick Extempore* Prayers which is *actually Uttered*, without the plainest Absurdity and Contradiction?

And indeed you are (after your wonted manner) so kind as in the next Sentence to Disprove your self by saying the very Same in effect as I have just now said. For say you, *the Spirit so works sometimes in the Children of God in that Duty* (viz. of Prayer) *as that it cannot be Uttered*, whence you infer, that this cannot be understood of *Forms*

of

of Prayer, becauſe *it is Eaſy to utter a Form that is before Us.* In like manner I argue, that *the Spirit's working in Prayer* ſo as that *it cannot be uttered*, Cannot poſſibly be underſtood of *the Matter of your Extempore Prayer*, foraſmuch as you do *Actually Utter that* in your Congregations. And thus you have your ſelf *Diſproved the Texts* alledged by you to *juſtify Extempore* Prayer, and ſo have ſaved me the labour of *Clearing my ſelf of them*, and have brought on your ſelf the Trouble of *Clearing your ſelf of a New Contradiction.*

Beſides, had you not as little Regard to *Logick* as to *Me*, you might know, that tho' in Some *Particular* Caſes (Such as the time of *Diſtreſs* or *Sufferings*, to which the Apoſtle particularly refers) we *may not know what Particularly to pray for as we ought*; yet it doth not thence follow, but that we *may know* (*at All times*) *what in General to Pray for as we ought*, viz. *All things that are requiſite for Our Souls or Bodies, ſo far forth as God ſhall ſee Expedient for Us.* And that both the *Matter* and *Manner* of our *Common Prayer* is thus truely Agreeable to the Will of God, you may learn from *the Exhortation* at the Beginning, and St. *Chryſoſtom's Prayer* at the End. And thus you may ſee, if you will, that neither *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. nor *the other place* of Scripture you refer to, can make Any thing *Againſt our Forms*, or *For Extempore Prayer in Publick*; and therefore there is no need I ſhould *Clear my ſelf of them*, or that you ſhould have *mentioned them* being *nothing to the purpoſe.*

2. I call upon you, Sir, to ſhew in what part of my Letters I have *Declaimed ſo loudly againſt Extempore prayer* as *wholly to run it down*, or *to uſe Reproachfull Expreſſions about It*, or to ſay that *It is Sinfull in its ſelf.* 'Till you do this (which I am ſure you *Cannot*) there is no occaſion for me to *Anſwer* what Biſhop *Wilkins* ſaith on that ſubject, ſince he ſaith *Nothing againſt what I have ſaid*; nor need I *reply* any thing to what you mention of *Some of Our Own Communion practiſing Extempore Prayer* (for I ſuppoſe you mean) *before their Sermons*, becauſe *Our Church* gives them Liberty to Do ſo, if they think fit, after they have read the *Common Prayer*; and therefore *ſuch their Practice* is *Suitable* to the *Allowances* made by *Our Church*, and *not Contrary*, or *in Oppoſition to* her

Rules,

Rules, as your *Practice* is. Whence it clearly follows, that *my Arguing will* by no means *make them False Teachers as much as you and other Dissenting Teachers.*

I have now largely consider'd *All* you have said in your Letter by way of *Objection* Against the Arguments made use of by me *For Forms* of Prayer; and shall leave the Impartial Reader to judge, whether I have not proved the several Particulars urged by you to be *Hints* (*not* of *Mine*, but) of *your own Nakedness.* And shall only observe here further on this Head, that notwithstanding the Dislike you pretend *to Forms*, yet I am apt to believe, that were your *Prayers* and *Sermons* carefully taken in writing for one *Twelve-month*, or but for *Six months*; it might appear, that both your *Prayers* and *Sermons* are at the bottom no other than *Forms*, somewhat *chopt* and *changed* several ways, (just as if One should begin sometime with one part, another time with another part &c. of the *Common Prayer*) and that you only *Delude* and *Put upon* Weak and Unthinking People by giving out, that you Pray *Extempore.* But whether you pray *Extempore* or *Not*, is no ways material, since 'tis evident, that if *your Praying* and *Preaching* be *like to your Writing*, it is Far from being *By the Spirit*; and yet I leave you to find out a Reason, (if you can) why you should not pretend to *Write by the Spirit* as well as to *Pray or Preach by the Spirit*, since the Apostles, who *Prayed* and *Preached by the Spirit*, did also *Write by the same Spirit.*

The next Head you think fit to take notice of, is that of *Ordination*, of which you speak thus:

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

I cannot forbear further observing, how the power of Truth constrains you to yeild the power of ordination to presbiters in Scripture times, and whatever other order under that name hath been set up since divested of that power, we have no concern with it, professing ourselves to be of scripture institution & no other; though all along the papal usurpation ordination as well as other things were disordered, yet in the times of reformation things should be restored to their primitive pattern, as well as other matters were in all other reformed Churches, and even in yours the superiority of

biſhops above presbiters was long after the reformation looked upon but as a humane conſtitution, as many biſhops themſelves have acknowledged, and the crying it up as jure divino is but of late ſtanding.

Dr. WELLS's *Anſwer.*

Before I enter upon the Arguing part of your foregoing paragraph, I deſire to know what you mean by the ſtrange Word [*Presbiters.*] For I am not aſhamed to own, that I do not remember that in my Reading, I ever met with It afore. I know indeed that ſome of the *Clergy* are called *Presbyters*, and that ſuch is the True way of Writing the *Engliſh* Name, you might have learnt from *my Letters*, had you either ſo much as *Read* them, or had you not been *Reſolved* rather to *Spell Falſely* than to *Agree with Me* in the *manner of Spelling* the ſaid Word. I believe, that even your mighty *Greek* Hero or Champion *Achilles* will not be able to *juſtify your skill in the Greek Language* ſo far, as to Free it from being *much called in queſtion* on this account of your *Spelling* the aforeſaid word, *not with due Analogy* to the Original *Greek* Word. Had the word occurred in your Letter *but once* ſo writ, I had took no notice of it, but had aſcribed it to mere *Inadvertency*; but when it ſtands there ſo writ no leſs than *three* or *four times*, 'tis evident that it muſt proceed from *Another* Cauſe. But after all I will do you this piece of Juſtice to Acquaint the World, that (ſince I received your Letter) I have been informed by an Honeſt *Lay-man*, (which I particularly mention, to prevent your having Hard Thoughts of Any *Clergy-man*) that it appears from *your Letter to Me*, that you are within ſome late years very much *Come off* from that *Rigid Non-Conformity* you formerly ſhewed to *the Received Way of Spelling*. And therefore ſince you have been thus *Brought over* in Some Tolerable meaſure to *Orthography*, I will not quite Deſpair, but that you may in time be *Brought over* likewiſe to *Orthodoxy*. Thus much then for the *Falſeneſs of your Spelling*, next for the *Falſeneſs* (not of your *Arguing*, for you have, I acknowledge, avoided that, by contenting your ſelf only with *Bare Aſſertions*; and therefore I can proceed

proceed to shew the *Falseness* but) *of What you Assert or Say*, in that part of your Letter we are now upon.

You say then that *I yield the Power of Ordination to Presbyters in Scripture-times*; which (in the Sense you understand the words in) is apparently *False*, as may be seen more especially p. 32. of my *Letter to you*, where I prove that *the Power of Ordination did not belong to Presbyters properly so called in the New Testament*, and therefore did not belong to *such Presbyters as your Ordination was Derived from*; and *with whom* therefore *you are altogether Concerned*, how vainly soever you *profess your self to be of Scripture-Institution*. 'Tis true indeed, that *you have no Concern with any other Order set up since the Scripture-times under the Name of Presbyters*, and *Divested of the Power of Ordination*, because there *never was Any such Order*, no not so much as *mentioned* (as I know of) by Any One but your self: and your Mention of It plainly shews that you are to Learn the great Difference between being *Divested* and *Not Invested*.

As to the *Irregularities* which had crept into *Ordination* during the *Papal Usurpation*, they were removed at the *Reformation* in *our Church*; and *All things were Restored to their Primitive pattern* more exactly *in our Church* than *in Other Reformed Churches*, as in other Instances, so particularly because *We retained the Distinction of the Three Ministerial Orders* in agreement to the *Primitive Pattern*.

Whereas you say that the *Crying up of the Superiority of Bishops to Presbyters as* jure Divino *is but of late Standing*, you do only betray thereby your Want of Knowledge in *Ecclesiastical* Affairs. For a Right *Knowledge in these* would have convinced you, that the aforesaid Doctrine is no other than the Received Doctrine of the *Primitive Church*, and that such as did *Oppose* it in the *more Early* times were always *Censured* and *Condemned* by the *General Consent of the Antient Councils*. And in like manner ever since the *Reformation* such as have gone about to Call the said Doctrine in Question, or Pretend the aforesaid *Superiority* to be only of *Humane Institution*, have always been looked upon *in our Church* as *Heterodox* and *Unsound*. And if you really know of *Many Bishops that have acknowledged the E-*

piſcopal Superiority to Presbyters to be of no other than *Human Inſtitution*, you would have done ſome Kindneſs in giving their Particular Names, that *Others may know them* too; if you do not truely *know Many*, you ought not to have made ſo *very Free with that High Sacred Order*, as to *Caſt ſuch a Slur* upon It. But be what you ſay as it will, out of my *Profound and Bounden Reverence to that Apoſtolical Order* I ſhall only Add, that I leave *you* or *Any Other* (whoſoever) to *Diſprove*, what I have ſaid concerning the *Apoſtolical Conſtitution of Epiſcopacy* as received *in the Church of England*, in p. 33, &c. of my *Letter to your ſelf*: and alſo that ſuppoſing (after all) *Our Epiſcopacy* to be only of *Humane Conſtitution*, yet you are bound in *Conſcience to Comply with It* and *Obey your Biſhop*, as may be gathered from what I have proved in my *Firſt Head* of my *Firſt Letter*, and may be ſeen more particularly and largely proved by Mr. *Bennet* in his Diſcourſe of *Schiſm* ch. 9. and laſtly as may be plainly and fairly inferred from the *Practice* even of *ſuch Biſhops* as you mention. For though *Theſe Biſhops* may or might think *their Superiority over Presbyters* to be of *Humane Conſtitution*, yet they *muſt in Charity be ſuppoſed* to think it notwithſtanding to be a *Lawfull Conſtitution* and *Not Diſagreeable to the Rule of Scripture*, or elſe they would (*Agree with you* in other reſpects as well as this, and) ſtand *Self-Condemned*, namely by *exerciſing a Power which they judged Unlawfull*.

Well, but if All you have hitherto Alledged, be thus proved to make *nothing Againſt* what I have ſaid Concerning the *Invalidity of your Presbyterian Ordination*; yet you think there remains ſtill *Three Rocks* in my way, and I muſt unavoidably *run upon All three*. But I doubt not but I ſhall meet with Better Succeſs, and ſo ſhall venture on with good Heart and Courage.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

Your arguing to overthrow our ordination runs you upon 3 rocks.

1: to advance an uninterrupted ſucceſſion of ordination from the Apoſtles to theſe times, which can never be made out, and all

proteſtants

protestants writing against the papists laugh at it, to defend it you must trace it through all the darknes of popery, where you will have many insuperable difficultys, you will find many schismes, many popes at a time severally ordaining bishops, and very hard to know which was the true, and whether your succession be from the true & not the schismaticall, & how you will clear it from not proceeding from pope Jone I leave to you to determine, your argument seems to inferre a certain vertue droping from the fingers of the ordainer on the ordained, which savours ranke of popery, tending to make orders a sacrament, which all protestants deny.

Dr. WELLS's *Answer.*

It is what the *Church of England* justly *Glories* in, that She is Able to Make out her Claim to an *Uninterrupted Succession of Ordination from the Apostles to these times*; and whosoever asserts the Contrary, only betrays his own Ignorance in *Church-history*. Though your Followers are so Weak in themselves, and so unreasonably Civil to you, as to *Believe whatever you say*; only because *you say It*; yet you must not expect that *Others* will be so *Put upon*, but that they will look for *Good Proof* of what you say, *before they believe It*. Whereas on the contrary you are not pleased to give One Single Positive Proof that the aforesaid Succession hath been ever *Interrupted*, but content your self Barely to Assert with Great Confidence and as Great Untruth, that *Such a Succession can never be made out, and that all the Protestants writing against the Papists laugh at it*. Pray consider whether you do not deserve to be *laughed at your self* for an Assertion so Groundless and apparently False. Surely the *Episcopal Protestants* make up a very Considerable Part of the *Protestants*, and Any one but *your self* would think in reason, that *These* do *not laugh at the Papists* for what they themselves *maintain* and *know to be True*.

As for what you *Hint* concerning the *Darkness of Popery*, the *Plurality of Popes at the same time*, and a *Pope Jone*, they are All of them so many more *Hints* of your Want of Knowledge in *Church-Affairs*. For in the *Darkest time of Popery* there is Great *Light* as to the Point of *Ordination*,

and your Thinking *Otherwise* is only an Evidence of your being Extremely *in the Dark*, as to the true State of *that Age*, which is commonly called the *Dark Age*, and as to the true Reason of It's being *so Called*.

And the *Plurality of Popes at the same time* doth not in the least Prejudice the *Succession of Ordination*; and your thinking *Otherwise* is only a Proof of your not Knowing, that the same Person, which is *not a Rightfull Pope*, yet may be a *Rightfull Bishop*; and consequently may have *a just Right* to exercise the *Power of Ordination*, though He may *not have a just Right* to exercise the *Papal Authority*, as received in the *Church of Rome*. And this Consideration being of *Universal* Extent, I purposely pass by Others, which might be urged in reference ro our Church in particular.

However, I cannot but observe from hence that you have unawares let drop from your Pen what is sufficient to prove your self to be a Schismatical Teacher. For whereas you say, that *in the Darkness of Popery we shall find Many Schisms, many Popes at the same time*, and that *'tis hard to Know, which was the True, and which the Schismatical*; you plainly acknowledge, that there may be a *Schism*, where there is a *perfect Agreement* not only in *Fundamentals*, but also in *Rites and Ceremonies*, if so be there is notwithstanding an *Open Opposition between the Members of the said Church*; and agreeably that whenever there were *many Popes at a time*, there could be but *One true or Rightfull Pope*, and the *Others* were to be esteem'd *Schismatical*. Whence it will follow much more, that the *Dissenters* are guilty of *Schism*, because though they May *Agree with us in Fundamentals*, yet they *openly Oppose the Church of England* in other respects: and it will also follow that Any one that sets himself up to be *a Teacher in opposition to the True and Rightfull Minister* of any Parish, he thereby becomes a *Schismatical Teacher*, namely (if for *no other* reason, yet for *this alone*, viz.) because He *Opposes openly the True and Rightfull Minister*.

Let the Reader now judge, whether you are not *Run upon a Rock* so far, as miserably to *Shatter and Split the Cause* you are imbarked in: and yet it will presently appear that you

you have received still *more Damage* as to the Reputation of *your own Scholarship*. For whereas you *leave me to clear the Succession of our Ordination from proceeding from Pope Jone*, I am sure this is as far as any thing Can be, from Carrying along with it an *Insuperable Difficulty*. For though I do by no means love to be Foolishly Confident without grounds, yet I may venture to say, that 'twill prove an *Insuperable Difficulty* for you make out, that there ever was a *Pope Jone*. Indeed I have read of a *Pope Joan*, and if this be the same you mean, you have given a new *Hint*, that you cannot yet quite shake off your Old *Nonconformity to true Spelling*. Had One of your *poor Ignorant Hearers* thus spelt his wife's name, it had been easily Excuseable; but for Mr. *Dowley*, that Great Scholar, that is so much read in the *Greek* (or suppose only in the *English*) *New Testament*, Not to Know how to Write the said Name more Conformably to the Word it is derived from, viz. *Joanna*, or at least, to the Received Way of Spelling It among the Learned, is not so easily to be Excused.

Hitherto you have given (in this paragraph of your Letter) *Hints* of your *Unacquaintedness with Church-History* and *True Spelling*; but you give in the last place an *Hint* of (what is much *worse* and *more Discommendable*, viz.) *your Disingenuity*. For I appeal to you your self, whether you do not well know, that We of the *Church of England* as well as *Other Protestants Deny Orders to be a Sacrament*, and *Condemn* the contrary Opinion as a vain piece of *Popery*. And therefore Could you but have prevailed on your self to *Deal for once Ingenuously*, you could not have suspected Any thing that I have said of the *Virtue of Ordination to tend* in the least towards the *Popish Opinion*; but would have understood It to import no more than *what is Allowed by All that Allow Ordination*, viz. that *the Imposition of Hands is the Scriptural way of Setting men apart to the Ministry*; and that *No Persons can Duely take upon them to exercise such Imposition of Hands, but Those that have had the said Power or Authority Duely transmitted down to them from the Apostles, as have the Bishops of Our Church*. But the foregoing Instance is not the only Instance of *your*

Disingenuity, as will appear from what comes next in your Letter.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

2: *your discourse drives you to set up an order of presbiters that the scripture is unacquainted with, viz, not having power of ordination, which you own scripture presbiters might have, and in so doing I shall leave it to you to consider, how you can clear your selfe of that charge you lay against us; and how you can make yourself an officer of scripture appointment.*

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

Sir, either you must own that you did not *carefully read over my Letter to you*, or else you must be guilty of notorious *Disingenuity*, in *misrepresenting* what I say, so as you do in the foregoing paragraph. Have I not there expresly prov'd (p. 31, 32) that it is evident from 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. compar'd with 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. as also from *Titus* 1. 5. that the *Presbytery* or *Presbyters there mentioned had not the Power of Ordination*? and therefore is it any other than a *downright Untruth* for you to say, that *I set up an Order of Presbyters that the Scripture is unacquainted with*? Wherefore this *same Assertion* of yours being thus plainly *False*, All that you *infer from It* falls to the ground of it self; and *my Charge against the Validity of your Orders still holds Good*, and *I my self* appear from the *Texts last cited* to be an *Officer of Scripture-appointment*, tho' *not invested with the Power of Ordination*.

As to what you mention concerning *my Owning that Scripture-Presbyters might have the Power of Ordination*, would you have been so *Ingenuous* as to have *Carefully Read and Considered*, what I have said concerning the *Promiscuous Use of the Word* [*Presbyter*] *in the Scripture-times*, you could not but have perceived that what I say upon the forementioned Point, *Cannot possibly make Any thing for you. And whenever you shall think fit to Undertake to Disprove what I have said on this head, paragraph by paragraph, as I have done here in reference to your Letter; then I perswade my self that you will find that what I have Allowed, makes Nothing For, but Much Against you*, and that *you will meet with some Conviction inwardly*, tho' you may think *it proper to Stifle It.*

I have

I have I think clearly escaped *Running upon any Rock* hitherto; and of the *Three Rocks* you mentioned there remains now but *One* more to be escaped; and I assure my self of the like Good success, and so proceed on.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

3: *you unchurch most if not all the reformed churches beyond sea, for they have no other ordination then what is among the dissenters, and so we may see your charity to the protestant religion, that while you acknowledge the papal ministry, you disown that in the protestant churches abroad; I wish by the advancing of this opinion you be not pulling down yourselves with your own hands, for nothing renders any party more hatefull to god & man, than such monopolising true ministry and salvation among themselves, this gave a good step towards the overthrow of Rome, she would be the only church though wretchedly degenerate & the mother of harlots, no salvation without conformity to her, no true worship ministry nor ordinances but in her way, & this gave occasion to those that loathed her abominations to depart out of her, & it may be admonition to others least they stumble at that stumbling stone.*

Dr. Wells's *Answer.*

I can easily guess at your policy in placing *this Rock* last, as being in your opinion the *Greatest* of the Three, and so Great, that tho' I might possibly *Keep off* from receiving any prejudice by the *Two former*, yet I could not but *Run foul upon This*, and *Ruine my Cause*. But alas! poor man, you might have known (had you been pleas'd ever to Consult *our Writers*) that *this same Rock* has been long since *quite Blown up*, and so *Levell'd* as to be put out of any Capacity of *Hurting* the Cause I am imbarked in.

I very well know, that *you* and *your Brethren* do not scruple Basely to *Delude* and *Deceive* poor Ignorant people in this matter, by telling them that the *Protestants beyond Sea are most (if not all) in an exact Agreement with your selves as to manner of Ordination, Worship*, &c. But tho' you make

make no Conſcience thus to Beguile and Miſlead Ignorant People, who know little (if any thing) more of the Tranſactions of the World than what lies within the narrow Compaſs of *Eight or Ten miles round them*; yet you ſhould have been more Prudent than to think to *Put upon Others* after ſuch a manner, Who are *much Better Acquainted* with the *State of the Proteſtants beyond Sea* than *you* ſeem to be by *your Letter*.

'Twill I ſuppoſe be a great Surprize to *your Followers* to hear and have plainly proved and made out, (What is ſo directly Contrary to the Wrong Notions you have inſtilled into them, viz.) *that All the Proteſtants beyond Sea* do Approve of *Our Rites* and *Ceremonies*, and *Epiſcopal Ordination*, &c. as *Very Lawfull*, and do *Condemn your Separation* from our Church *as Unwarrantable*, and yet this is no Other than what ſhall be made Good in my intended Treatiſe above-mentioned.

In the mean while 'twill be abundantly ſufficient to obſerve in general, that *your Caſe* is *very far different* from the *Caſe* of the *Proteſtant Churches beyond Sea* as to the matter of *Ordination*; and therefore the Denying the *Validity* of *your Ordination* will not preſently amount to a like Flat Denial of the *Validity of their Ordination*; neither do I go about preſently to *Un-church them*, tho' what I have ſaid concerning the Invalidity of your Ordination is Enough to *Un-Church* All the *Diſſenters in England*.

And hence you may learn, that the *Church of England* is far from *Monopoliſing True Miniſtry and Salvation to Her ſelf*, or from ſaying That *there is no True Worſhip but in her Way*, &c. tho' She doth maintain that *Schiſm* or an *Unneceſſary Separation from her Communion by ſuch as ought to Submit to Her Lawfull Injunctions, is a Damnable Sin*; and Conſequently that *All the Diſſenters in England that are Guilty of ſuch a Separation, are Guilty of a Damnable Sin*; and *as long as they Continue ſo, are Out of a State of Salvation*. And this is ſuch a *Monopoliſing of Salvation* as the *Scripture* plainly warrants again and again; and therefore to *Blame it*, is to *Blame the Scripture it ſelf*.

I shall only observe further, that had you consulted Mr. *Bennet's Book of Schism* from ch. 6. to ch. 11. inclusively, you might have seen what you say in this last paragraph, *answered afore you wrote*; and that what you say concerning the *Church of Rome*, hath no Relation *to our Church*, and therefore is *altogether Impertinent*: and lastly, that I am under no Apprehension of *Our Church being Pulled down*, So long as Authority is Able to Keep off *your Party* from *Laying Violent Hands* upon Her. Let us then Proceed.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

Your paraleling the dissenters with the Papists is most trifling, & lays you exceeding open, it's very well known the dissenters are at the remotest distance from them, & they themselves say that a reconciliation with some might be, but with us impossible, this turne of yours brings to my mind what is reported of Billingsgate, where the greatest w-re shall be sure to cry w--re first; between Rome & some others it is evident many real & design'd paralels may be made in doctrine constitution discipline & worship, but all that you have raked up concerning the dissenters is only nominal & accidentall; good is no less good though evil ones have counterfeited it to cover base designs, the pharisees made prayer a pretence to devour widows houses, yet is not prayer lesse a duty, & to be neglected & exploded thereupon, & so though Romane missionarys (supposing your relations to be true) have pretended to the spirit in prayer while they were destitute of the spirit, & had wicked purposes in hand, yet is not praying in the Holy Ghost to be cast away, & all turned into forme, praying extempore took not its rise from them, but is as old as the bible, and the learned Mr Clarkson hath sufficiently made out from Antiquity, that there were no such thing as formes made use of in the church for some centurys after Christ; its very certain that the papists have turned themselves into all shapes to divide protestants, & to blast & blemish the reformation, & many more instances might be given of their intreagues among you than us, but we object not to you such trifles, but things more weighty & real.

It

Dr. WELLS's *Answer.*

It had been much Better for you, Sir, had you contented your self to make use of the *plain common word* [*Comparing*] instead of that *Word of Art*, which you *Falsely write* [*Paraleling.*] For your Not Knowing how to write the Word more Agreeable to it's Derivation (as appears from more than One Instance in the foregoing paragraph of your Letter) is another Shrewd *Hint*, that *Greek* is truely *Greek to you*, and that you are not endued with the *Gift of Tongues*, tho' you vainly pretend to that of *Utterance*, whereas they are *Both joyned together* in the very Text, where the Apostles are said to *speak* (namely, *with other Tongues*) *as the Spirit gave them Utterance.* And therefore your mentioning above that the Apostles *prayed as the Spirit gave them Utterance Act.* 1. 24, 25. and *Act.* 4. 24, to 30. is no other in effect than *Two False Citations*; inasmuch as there is no mention made in either of the forecited places of their *Praying* then, *as the Spirit gave them Utterance*; but you Boldly and Unwarrantably take part of a verse out of *one* Chapter, and heedlessly apply it to parts of *two other* Chapters.

Moreover you your self, Sir, do not Deny, but that *the Parallel* I have drawn (by way of *Specimen* of what might be more Largely done that way) between the *Dissenters and Papists* holds *True*, and therefore if it be *most Trifling*, it can become so only on account of the *Triflingness* of the Instances wherein the said *Parallel* is drawn. And if you think fit thus to Intimate, that *Praying and Preaching Without Book &c.* as Opposed to *Praying and Preaching Within Book*, are Matters *Most Trifling* to be insisted upon, I think you are much *in the Right*; and shall only add, that you would do well to Act accordingly, and Not to keep up a *Separation* on account of Such Matters as are by your own Confession *Most Trifling.*

Well, but it seems the aforesaid *Parallel brings to your mind* (What? Why it might have been reasonably expected in consideration of Mr. *Dowley*'s Great *Gravity*

and

and *Purity, a Text of Scripture*; or at least in consideration of Mr. *Dowley's* Great *Learning, a saying out of some Learned Author*: but no such matter, Mr. *Dowley's Gravity, Purity*, and *Learning* is not so Great, but that He can upon Occasion Condescend to take up with *What is reported at Billingsgate*. To have thus recourse to Such a place as *Billingsgate*, is What one would not think strange of among a Company of *Porters*, or a *Crew* of Fellows that have been *Bred up at Horses heels*: but it seems very Unbecoming Mr. *Dowley*, who pretends to have *been Bred* up at least *at the feet of some* (Puritan) *Gamaliel*.

But what is it that is *reported of Billingsgate*? Why, that *there the Greatest W-re shall be Sure to cry W-re first*. Hah! what is the matter now? What, have We got in this *Fine Saying a Paw Word*, which is not fit to be written? Why then did not Mr. *Dowley's Gravity* and *Purity* prevail upon him to let quite alone the mentioning of the said Expression, if it could not be mentioned without some offence to Modesty? But Sir, one so Conversant in *Scripture* as you are, Surely cannnot be Ignorant, that the Word [*Whore*] frequently occurs in the *Holy Writings*; and therefore for you to be afraid, that the Writing of the aforesaid Word *in full* should *defile your Pen and Paper*, can be look'd upon as no other than the very Height of *Puritanical Squeamishness*, and *a Scruple* (just like the *Rest of your Scruples*, namely) *altogether* or *downright Anti-scriptural*. So much for the *Original or Rise of your fine saying*, and *your manner of writing it*: next for the *Design* and *Meaning of It*.

If then you dare but stand to the Determination of your *Billingsgate Proverb*, I doubt not but to make it quickly appear, that *your Party is the most Blameable*. For 'tis notoriously known to All that have any tolerable insight into the History of Our *Church Transactions since the Reformation*, that *your Party* at their *First Separating from our Communion* began to justify such their Practice by *Crying out against our Church* as the *Whore of Babylon*; and you have ever since maintained and kept up *your Separation* by no *Artifice* or

Cheat

Cheat more than by Continuing to *Cry out Against Us as Papists*. And this is Evident from *De Laune*'s Book you sent me, where are several Pages to this purpose And therefore with what Truth can you say, that my *Paralleling the Dissenters to the Papists* is as it were *Crying whore first*, when it appears from *De Laune*'s Book, that He had *paralel'd the Church of England to the Church of Rome above twenty years agoe*, and consequently *Cryed* (in the language of *your Fine Proverb*) *Whore First*? and therefore according to the inference you make from the said *Proverb*, you have fairly proved *your Own Party* to be (in the language of your *Billingsgate-Proverb*) *the Greatest Whore*.

I assure you, Sir, that Mr. *De Laune*'s Book was the Occasion of my Drawing up that short *Parallel* (at the end of my First Letter) between *you* and the *Papists*. For hearing a little after I was setled here, that the said Book was mightily esteemed by your Party, I procured It long afore I had drawn up *Either of my Letters*, and finding that the Author spent a very considerable part of his Book in drawing *a Parallel between Us and the Papists*: hereupon I thought with my self, that a more likely Method to make your Party sensible of the *Weakness of this Objection* (so much insisted on by you) could not be taken, than by *Turning It upon* your selves, and by shewing that in those *very Things*, wherein you *differ from Us*, and which you *Extoll as peculiar Excellencies* in your way of Worship, you do after all *Agree with the Papists*. And I have not missed of my *Aim* herein, but have *Got* as much as I *Desired* from you in the matter. For it seems obvious and evident enough to a *Common Capacity*, that I have hereby *Forced you to Allow* What will *Answer and Confute All the Objections* made by your Party on this head. For say you, "*Good* is *no less Good* tho' *Evil ones* have counterfeited it to "cover base designs. The *Pharisees* made *Prayer* a Pre- "tence to Devour Widows Houses; yet is *not Prayer less a* "*Duty*, and to be *Neglected* and *Exploded* thereupon &c. In like manner say I according to your own way of Arguing; "*Good is no less Good* tho' the *Papists* may make "use of it: and therefore tho' the *Papists pray by Form*, yet "is

"is not *Praying by Form less a Duty*, or to be *Neglected* and "*Exploded* thereupon, and All turned into Extempore "Prayer: tho' the *Papists kneel at prayers*, particularly *at* "*the Sacrament, use the Cross in Baptism* &c. yet these *Decent* "*Rites* are not therefore to be presently *Cast away*". And after the like manner may the far Greatest part of *De Launes* Book be *Confuted* by what you your self are Forced to *Acknowledge* in this your Letter to be no other than *Truth*. And so you have pretty well quit scores with the said Book. For whereas the said Book (tho' sent by you to Me to be your Voucher) had the Ill manners to give the *Flat Ly* to what you were pleased to say at the *beginning of your Letter*, you at the *end of your Letter* have yielded a *Truth*, which will *Answer All* (or *most part*) that follows in the said Book from p. 17 to the end; and likewise the other adjoyning Treatise stiled, the *Image of the Beast*: and so you have took here *full* Revenge for the *Affront* you met with at the Beginning from your Voucher as should have been.

Your mentioning what is said of the Pharisees by our Saviour, viz. that *they made Prayer a Pretence to Devour Widows houses*, gives me just occasion to pray to God, that He would be pleased to give you such a measure of his Grace as to enable you *Impartially* to Examine your Own Conscience as to this *Pharisaical Practice*, and whether you are *not Faulty in the same respect*. To which end consider, that 'twas not Barely *by Praying*, but (as our Saviour assures us) *by making Long Prayers*, and so *pretending* that they were *more Gifted than others* by reason of such *Long Extempore* Prayer (for I suppose you will not Allow they made use of *Forms* in those Early times,) that the *Pharisees* were wont to *Devour Widows Houses*, that is, so far to *Insinuate themselves into the Good Opinion of silly Women as to Get away All they had in Gifts and Presents*. And how near this Case comes to that *of you* and *your Followers*, is too well known to need further Explanation.

Had *your skill in matters relating to the Papists* been as Great as *your Zeal against them*, you would have known, that Those called by you *Roman Missionaries* might with more accuracy

accuracy have been called *Romiſh Miſſionaries* (the more Learned and Accurate Writers having thought fit to obſerve a Diſtinction between the two words, *Roman* and *Romiſh*, the better to Avoid Ambiguity) but this being a ſort of Nicety, it is the more eaſily Excuſeable, and therefore I ſhall inſiſt no longer upon It, but proceed to Obſerve that what you ſay of the *Romiſh Miſſionaries*, may be ſaid likewiſe of *you* and *your Brethren*, namely that *you* (as well as *they*) *pretend to the Spirit in Prayer, while you are deſtitute of the Spirit.* For is it not juſtly to be Feared, that ſuch *your Pretence* is chiefly to *Cover Baſe Deſigns*? and is it not Known, that you likewiſe have *wicked purpoſes in hand*, viz. to *Deceive poor Ignorant People in matters which concern their Eternal Salvation*? Sir, I aſſure you with the *Sincerity* and *Charity of a Chriſtian*, that my *Heart even Trembles for you and your Brethren*, when I conſider how much your vain Pretenſions to the Extraordinary Aſſiſtances of the *Spirit in Prayer*, &c. make way for your Own and Others Running into the *Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt*; whilſt thereby you aſcribe *Unwarrantable Expreſſions* and ſometimes *Downright Blaſphemies* to the *Holy Spirit of God*; and Encourage Every *pitifull Ignorant Fellow* to be ſo *Impudent* and *Irreligious* as Not to be Afraid to Aſſert *Publickly*, that *What He Speaks* or *writes, is as the Spirit gives him Utterance*; foraſmuch as He well knows, that *He hath as much to ſhew for the Spirit's ſo Giving him Utterance*, as *you and your Brethren have.*

You do no other than make uſe of the *Popiſh Jeſuitical* Artifice of *Quibbling*, when you ſay, that *Praying Extempore took not it's Riſe from the Papiſts, but is as Old as the Bible.* For tho' it be True, that *Praying Extempore*, when Rightly Qualified, *is as Old as the Bible*; yet 'tis as True, that *Praying Extempore* when Not rightly Qualified, but uſed as by you in *Oppoſition to the Lawfull Commands of the Rulers of the Church* &c. is *not as Old as the Bible*, but was *Firſt brought up* amongſt Us by the *Popiſh Prieſts* in order to cauſe *Diviſions*; and hath been ever ſince *kept up* by the *Diſſenting Teachers* to the ſame end and purpoſe. Sure I am that *Forms of Prayer are as old as the Bible*, as you may learn

learn not only from the *Lord's Prayer in the New Testament*, but from several Instances in the *Old Testament*, as *Numb.* 6. 23, 24, 25, 26. *Deut.* 21. 7, 8. &c. as may be more largely seen in *Cases of Conscience Resolved concerning the Lawfulness of Joyning with Forms of Prayer* &c. Part 2d. Case 5. Where also may be seen that Mr. *Clarkson's Learning* was not so Great, or at least His *Impartiality* was not so Sincere, as to Free him from maintaining a Great Falsity, by affirming that *Forms of Prayer were not in use for some Centuries after Christ*. The Contrary whereof is plainly proved in *Case* 5. *of the Treatise above-mentioned*, as also in Mr. *Bennet's Abridgement* from p. 55 to p. 69. and Dr. *Cumber's History of Liturgies* ch. 1, 2, 3, &c.

What might be further added to shew, that the *Dissenting Teachers* are in reality little other than *Tools made use of by the Papists to Destroy the Church of England*, and so *to Restore Popery*, I shall have Occasion to take large Notice of It in my *next Treatise*, and so shall Omit It here; only Observing, that *you*, Sir, and *your Brethren* seem to take Great Care to Keep your Followers in Deep Ignorance as to Any Particulars which might tend to Open their Eyes and to let them see, that the *Bishops* and *Ministers of the Church of England* are so far from (what is truely called) *Popery*, that they have been All along the *Main Bulwarks of the Protestant Religion Against the Papists*; and accordingly have been, and still are Acknowledged as such by the *Protestant Churches beyond Sea*; tho' you and your Brethren are not Ashamed *Falsely to Misrepresent* them to your Bigotted Followers as *Papists*. Wherefore I cannot but take this Opportunity to Acquaint your *Followers*, that the Chief *Compilers of the Common Prayer* were *Burnt* in the Reign of the *Popish* Queen Mary I. and therefore to be sure were *Far from being Papists*, when they chose to *lay down their Lives for the sake of the Protestant Religion*. And again in the reign of the late *Popish King* James II. *several Bishops of our Church* were *Imprisoned in the Tower*, and *Tryed*, and *Other Ministers of Note in Our Church were Suspended*, &c. for *Opposing* the Designs then on foot to *Bring in Popery*; whilst

the *Diſſenters* were *highly Careſſed and Favoured by the ſaid Popiſh King* James II. and his Party. And ſurely nothing more *Weighty* or *Real* can be urged to ſhew, that it is *by means of the Diſſenters* that the *Papiſts* hope ſtill to *Deſtroy* one time or other the *Church of England*, and then to *Advance Popery* upon her Ruin.

I have now gone thro' All the ſeveral *Hints* you threatned me with above; and whether they have done *More Hurt* to *my* Cauſe or *yours*, let the Reader Determine. I ſhall only obſerve, that they ſeem to have been ſo far from *making Good thoſe Two or Three Points or Heads* they were brought for, that they can by no means be Allowed as ſufficient *to ſerve for All the Reſt.*

The only Three Heads you have taken notice of in your Letter, are theſe, *viz. Forms of Prayer, your Presbyterian Ordination*, and my *Specimen* of a *Parallel* that might be *Drawn between you and the Papiſts.* And you have been ſo far from *Diſproving* the Arguments I have made uſe of on each of the forementioned Heads, that as to *Forms of Prayer* you have Aſſerted *What will Juſtifie it againſt all Objections*; and as to my *Paralleling you with the Papiſts*, you have thereby been forced to Acknowledge *What will evidently ſhew the Weakneſs of the Objections made by your Party againſt Us on account of our Agreement with the Papiſts*; and laſtly, as to *your Ordination* you have ſhewn that you are ſo Far from *Rightly Underſtanding the Controverſy* about ſuch *Presbyterian Ordination*, that you do not *Rightly know* ſo much as to *Spell the word* [*Presbyter*]: To paſs by many other *Falſe Spellings* which are to be Found in *your Letter*, tho' I have not ſo much as taken notice of them, excepting only your [*Jure*], [*Paraleling*], and [*Paralel*].

How many *other Heads* be there mentioned in *my Letter*, which you have not ſo much as *Spoken One Word* about, much leſs *Diſproved* them? And yet if they *hold Good* and *Cannot be Diſproved*, *your own Practice* and that of *your Followers* muſt be allowed to be *Erroneous and Sinfull*. And upon theſe Conſiderations I cannot but Believe, that 'twill be thought by All Impartial judges, that there ſtill remains

very

very Great Occasion for you to Write again, if not to Appear in Print; notwithstanding All you have been pleased to Alledge to the Contrary. Indeed would you deal so Ingenuously, as Openly to Declare (what your Letter too plainly intimates to be) the True Reason of your Forbearing at present to Appear in Print, namely, that it is because you think it by no means Proper or Convenient for you to Appear in Print, till you can Appear in True Arguing, or at least in True Spelling; this is so Reasonable an Excuse as must be Allowed by Me and All Other Persons to be Entirely Sufficient and Satisfactory. And therefore I shall also forbear to say any more on that Subject, but proceed Duely to Consider the Counsel you give me in the Close of your Letter, which is as follows.

Mr. Dowley's Letter.

Sir If the counsel of one so much below you in names and titles might have any place, I would advise you to turn your thoughts from these weak and beggarly elements to the more weighty matters of religion; make the faith of christ and the Love of God more your study than the advancement of ceremony, which is at best but sticking mint Annise & Cummin, I am sure it would be more pleasing to god, profitable to your People, and comfortable to your self at last, if your spirit be wholly taken up with form gesture & habit in religion, I must professe to you mine is not, I have Matters of greater concern to my self and others to exercise my mind upon, and though I have digressed so far to write this privately to you, yet you must look for no more of this nature from me, It is not meet that I should leave the substance to serve ceremony, & so I bid you heartily farewell.

your very humble servant
Lutterworth march 15 :
1703. *P: Dowley.*

Dr. WELLS's *Answer.*

Sir, I must say that *your Letter* is All of a piece, and that as you *Begin* so you *End* it with *Disproving your self* or *Self-Contradiction*; so that *your Counsel* is of no use, but to expose the *Weakness of the Counseller*, and his great *Unfitness* for such an Office.

You do not deny but the *Requiring Obedience to our Ceremonies is Tithing Mint, Anise and Cummin*, and This is abundantly enough to *justifie the Writing of my Letter*; and *your Counselling* me as if I had *not done well* therein, only shews that *you can give Counsell which is directly contrary to the Counsell of our Saviour himself.* For our Saviour in the very same places you refer to (*viz.* Mat. 23. 23. or Luke 11. 42.) expressly saith, that the *Tithing of Mint &c.* and therefore *Obedience to Ceremonies* (as being the same by your own confession) *ought not to be left Undone.* Hence may be seen, how *very Unfit* a Person you are to be a *Spiritual Guide*, since you scruple not to *Find Fault* with what our Saviour *requires*; and to *Counsell against Doing*, what our Saviour expressly *Counsells Not to leave Undone*; and how plainly Blame-worthy *you* and *your Followers* are, whilst you thus *Openly Disregard and Despise the Directions of Christ*, so far as to *Pride your selves*, and think your selves *Better* or *Purer Christians* than Others, only because *you Dare to leave quite Undone, what Christ* (however *small* the matters may be in themselves) *hath commanded not to be left Undone.* Hence Sir, you may learn, that were you but so Happy as *Rightly to Know*, what is *Pleasing to God*, what is *Profitable to the People*, and what will be *Comfortable to your selfs* at the *last*; you would know, that *your Sin* even by *starting your Thoughts from Lawfull Ceremonies* (tho' in themselves they were no other than *weak and beggerly Elements*) so far as to *have no Regard* thereto: you would know, that, was the *Faith of Christ and Love of God duely studied by you*, you would be induced thereby to have the same Concern for the *Advancement of Ceremony* as I have, namely in Order to the *Decent Performance of Religious Worship*, in *due Obedience to*

the

the Lawfull Injunctions of our Church-Governours, and lastly and above all as it seems to Restore the Primitive Peace and Unity of the Church, a matter of the very Highest Importance, as we learn from our Saviour, John 17. 21, 22, 23. and other places of Scripture: you would know, that your Spirit ought to be taken up (in the same measure as mine is) even with Form, Gesture, and Habit in Religion; and that there can be no Matters of so great Concern to your self and others, as to Excuse you in the sight of God from Exercising your Mind even upon those things which you now Mind not at all: lastly, you would know, that your Regard to Substance will not excuse your Disregard to Ceremony; and that there is no need to Leave the Former to Serve the Latter, but that Both may and ought to be duely attended upon, and are so by every True Christian.

Thus you may see, how very Ill your Counsel is even in every Particular of it, and that you sadly stand in need of Counsel your self, and of some one to be your Spiritual Guide into the Knowledge of the Truth, from which you are at present very Distant. And whereas you say, that tho' you have Digressed thus far to Write this Privately to me, yet I must look for no more of this Nature from you; 'tis not unlikely but Others may think that your Letter may indeed be very well lookt upon as one Long Digression, being very little to the purpose; and that you had consulted your own Credit much more, had you never sent to me Any thing of the Nature your Letter is of.

I shall only add, that for my part I am and ever shall be very Ready to do you Any Charitable Office in my Power, would you give me Leave. But by your Bidding me Heartily Farewell, you seem Not to care for my Company, but to be very Glad to be Rid of it: however my Charity to you will not suffer me to Part with you wholly yet, but only for some (no long) time, 'till I can get Ready what else I judge may (or at least ought to) be Serviceable and Beneficial to the Undeceiving of you and your Followers, and to the Bringing you out of the Thick Darkness of Erroneous Prejudice and Sinfull Obstinacy into the Light and Acknowledgment of the Truth.

To this Great End I shall close All with most Earnestly Beseeching *Almighty God* for the sake of *his Beloved Son* and *our Loving Saviour Jesus Christ*, to *Deliver* You and your Followers and all Others in the like sad and deplorable State, *from All false Doctrine and Schisms, from Hardness of Heart and Contempt of his Word and Commandment.*

So shall continually pray

Your most Faithfull and

Affectionate Servant in Christ,

Cowbach. March 25th. 1706.

EDW. WELLS.

FINIS.